

A2090

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

April 8

"How can you go ahead on a program that will be uncertain, developing timber you perhaps can't realize a thing on?"

Some Old-Fashioned Treatment for a Modern American Ailment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot about the need to get America moving these days, without a clear indication as to where we should go. We hear a lot about the lack of interest of rank and file Americans in the deliberations of Congress. We hear a lot about the President's personal popularity, and the lack of support for his program. We hear a lot that should lead us to believe Americans are expecting more positive leadership, and a clearer expression of where we are trying to go.

I received today my copy of the Dickinson Press, one of western North Dakota's oldest newspapers. The guest editorial in this issue of April 6, 1963, is written by a small businessman of Dickinson, N. Dak., who I believe is typical of millions of middle- to low-income Americans. I believe the thoughts he has expressed are shared by the vast majority of Americans and I believe all in Congress—and the leaders of this administration—could do well to give most serious heed to the thoughts expressed.

Americans want to be proud of their country, and they are willing to make such sacrifices as are necessary to keep our country strong, and the kind of country of which we have been justly proud in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the thoughts expressed by Mr. Wally Kack will prove of interest to the Members of the House of Representatives and provide food for thought in analyzing our national policy.

Under consent I insert his editorial following my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the Dickinson Press (N. Dak.) Apr. 6, 1963]

GUEST EDITORIAL

(By Wally Kack)

I am one of the Americans who heard Mr. Khrushchev tell our Nation that my great-grandchildren will grow up in a Communist world. For some time now, this has bothered me. I am not a brave man—not even a big one. I suppose I would have to admit that I am, among my own neighbors and in my own culture, the typical, average, well-educated, genteel citizen to whom family, mortgage, and security have been the all-important items.

I am now 52, and soon, my wife, daughter, and I will move into our new house. I paint my own house, repair my own car, grub my own devil grass, and nurse a modest savings account at the Liberty National Bank. I am a law-abiding man on the quiet side, and dissension makes me terribly nervous. Frankly, I am the kind who simply doesn't have it in him to fight anyone ever.

My wife had me cleaning out an old trunk in the storage room the other day, and I ran across the huge old family Bible that I hadn't thought about for years. My great-grandmother had kept a journal of the trip across the Great Plains with a wagon and oxen when she and great-grandpa were youngsters coming out to settle in Iowa in the great migration. Great-grandma wrote about it as the wild, new land, rich and abundant in mythical proportions.

On the trail she wrote of sickness and hunger, and heat and cold, and dust and thirst, and the deaths and births like beads strung together on a thread of hope—hope of freedom and a land of plenty for their children yet unborn. And when she viewed the new land, she wrote in simple word pictures of the cities and farms and schools, and happiness that would some day bloom in the greatness of the vast new land. She wrote of her tomorrow and my today.

The ink was badly faded, but the message was clear. As I read, I began to think about America and being an American and what it all stands for; and I thought about our enemies and what they intend to do to America, to those rich lands and farms, to the cities and the people, to its freedom and its hope.


And, suddenly, I realized that I am a sick American. I mean, really sick. I am sick of panacea and of backing up. I am sick of reaction where there should be initiative. I am sick of bureaucrats who tell me that my enemy is not really my enemy and that I should live together with murderers and tyrants. I am sick of Government that hasn't the guts to clean traitors out of its own offices. And I'm sick of being a nice, patient guy about it. I am sick of placidly accepting excuses instead of successes; of being a silent gentleman about it for fear of controversy. I am sick of my country being ridiculed all over the world. I am sick of pink-fingered diplomats and illy-livered politicians who place personal career above the fate of the flag.

I am sick of 40 years of relentless creeping, cancerous, communistic godlessness that never once has wavered from its avowed purpose of conquering that flag and seeing it trampled in the mud under Russian boots. I am sick of my genteel desire to stand pat and pray while the enemy advances.

I am sick of educators who teach tolerance of subversion and of clergymen who would have me quail at the specter of battle and turn my cheek in fear of what our enemies might do.

In all honesty, the thing of which I am most sick is the man who lets these things come to me: myself.

And by the living God who made me, sir, I am a sick American who intends to get well, and I hope that everyone who feels as I do will do his bit to recover from the malady which ails him.



What Is Behind President's Support of Castro?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the reporting of news on America's turning against Cuban exile patriots has a horrible nightmarish quality. If only this were just a bad dream. Is it possible the President cannot see that failure to declare the

reimposition of the Monroe Doctrine is the source of all our trouble—and that it will get worse?

First. The President says the raids will not weaken Castro—of course, they will but even if not they strengthen the hearts and hopes of freedom-loving people everywhere, especially in Cuba. Enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine would solve this one.

Second. The Cuban patriots raids will make it harder to get Soviet troops out of Cuba, the President opines. The implementation of the Monroe Doctrine would see the United States brooking no dilly-dallying—get the troops out now, or we'll drive them out.

Third. Raids on the Soviet ships are dangerous to the United States. They will bring reprisals possibly on American ships, the President forecasts. The Monroe Doctrine terms would not permit Russian shipments of arms and armaments in this hemisphere, and if they came, you bet it would be dangerous, for Russia. We would sink them.

What is this timid attitude of our leaders? Is the President afraid to stand up to Russia when our safety and protection are at stake? Is the United States sovereignty and safety not transcendent over Khrushchev's feelings?

The news articles from the U. S. News & World Report, when viewed in the light of the terms of the Monroe Doctrine, take on a somber, ominous note, pitilessly showing how weak and fearful is our policy.

A STRONGER CASTRO—WITH U.S. HELP?

Fidel Castro, growing militarily stronger week by week, suddenly finds himself getting protection from an unexpected quarter—the U.S. Government.

The United States, which once helped Cuban exiles attack Castro, now is causing their arrest for such activity.

A crackdown has been ordered by the Kennedy administration against anti-Castro raids mounted or supplied from U.S. territory.

To enforce this crackdown, the U.S. Coast Guard in Florida is being beefed up. On April 3, reinforcements began pouring in—200 more men, 12 more patrol boats, 6 more amphibious airplanes.

The help of Great Britain has been enlisted by the United States in this campaign.

On March 31, a boatload of 17 anti-Castro raiders was seized on Norman Cay, a tiny island in the British-ruled Bahamas, north of Cuba.

It was the British who made the arrests. But, the U.S. State Department admitted, it was the United States that tipped off the British.

At the same time the British were seizing one anti-Castro boat in the Bahamas, American authorities seized another in Miami.

CURBS ON LEADERS

Simultaneously, restrictions were placed on the activities of Cuban exile leaders in Miami. Orders were served on 25 of these leaders not to step outside the limits of Miami's Dade County.

To Cuban exiles, all this appeared to be an American act of betrayal.

As the drive against Cuban exiles grew, cries of protest rose from across the country.

Two years ago, the U.S. armed and trained Cubans for an invasion against Castro. Even after that invasion, the Kennedy administration continued to aid the exiles and assure them that eventually they would be able to oust the Cuban dictator.

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2089

GARMATZ OPPOSED PLAN

Although GARMATZ bitterly opposed granting the contract to Puget Sound, the Defense Department did so.

GARMATZ, who is the ranking member on the House Merchant Marine Committee, still is considering having the Government Operations Committee investigate the Puget Sound award.

Under the 90 percent formula established as a result of congressional pressure and industry protests, Puget Sound Bridge & Drydock Co. would not have been eligible.

The industry charged that the Government procurement policy relating to naval vessel construction gave an advantage to firms depending on foreign sources for fabrication of components.

COMPLETE HULLS CONSIDERED

After the Puget Sound award, other firms began to consider foreign fabrication—even to the extent of complete hulls—in bidding on ship construction contracts.

"The 90-percent formula is designed to curb that trend and to check the outflow of gold for payments of procurement abroad," GARMATZ stated.

"Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara is to be commended for taking prompt action in this matter," he said.

The Congressman had introduced legislation to amend the Buy American Act to exclude naval vessels from the application of the percentage rule. The effect of the bill, he said, would be to require complete conversion in the United States, a requirement already in the law for commercial vessels in the domestic coastwise trade.

Resolution for an American Ideals Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, a very illuminating resolution was adopted on April 1, 1963, by the pertinent committees, national officers, and department commanders of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. The title of that resolution is: "For an American Ideals Corps." The resolution is in keeping with the nationwide programs to advance Americanism and the annual Loyalty Day program sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The purpose of the resolution is to bring about the establishment of a Presidential Committee to promote the ideals and values of our free way of life, to offset the negativism which now attaches to so much of our public affairs and to strengthen confidence in our free institutions.

Mr. William Bowles, immediate State commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars for Ohio played a very significant role in the preparation and passage of this resolution.

Under unanimous consent, I insert the resolution in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION FOR AN AMERICAN IDEALS CORPS

Whereas it appears that there is in the United States today a growing tendency to devalue, or ignore, the richly patriotic heritage from which were derived our national character and the fundamental freedoms of the American way of life; and

Whereas an increasing variety of disturbing philosophies, of both foreign and domestic origins, strive to downgrade clear thinking, loyal, and dynamic American patriotism; and Whereas the continued impact upon our citizens of all such divisive influences may impair or destroy our national unity and security: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, through its commander in chief and its National Committees on Americanism, Loyalty Day, and Community Service, urge the President of the United States to create and activate an official Federal committee identified by such appropriate name as the President's Americanism Corps, or the President's Ambassadors of Loyalty, or the President's Committee for American Ideals; and be it

Resolved, That the President instruct his special body to establish and direct a vigorous nationwide campaign, implemented by volunteer patriotic individuals, organizations, and institutions, to the end that all loyal citizens, in every community of our land, may demonstrate vigorous, positive adherence to historically tested, old-fashioned American ideals and practices; and be it further

Resolved, That the Veterans of Foreign Wars urges its 1,300,000 members and all other loyal citizens to give their wholehearted support to such a movement as a most effective patriotic countermeasure against any effort to compromise, weaken, or destroy our American way of life.

Gains Tax Regarded as Fair for Timber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an excellent interview of Mr. William Swindells, written by Gerry Pratt, in the Portland, Oreg., Oregonian:

MAKING THE DOLLAR: GAINS TAX REGARDED AS FAIR FOR TIMBER

(By Gerry Pratt)

William Swindells is of the old school of timber industry executives, articulate and blunt. He knows this, refuses to waste time considering the politics of what he believes is right or wrong, and stays out of controversy by avoiding newspaper interviews.

But he was seated now, in the deep leather chair behind his desk in the Pacific Building, speaking for the record. "Providing I get to read it first."

Treasury men, perhaps seeking ways to pad back the money President Kennedy proposes to cut from the Nation's tax bill, have proposed eliminating the capital gains provisions on timber. That was enough to force the Willamette Valley Lumber Co., Santiam Lumber Co., Wood Fibreboard Co., and Western Kraft Co., executive to sit still and get the story of capital gains off his chest. He began with patience. "Starting back, prior to 1943, when if you had a block of timber to sell, there was never any question but what the taxes would be capital gains."

"Then people began cutting their timber to meet the maximum war effort and the excess profits tax, 80 percent, hit them. That didn't leave enough for them to replace their timber."

The result was tax legislation known as 831 the capital gains provision that allows timber operators to claim the profit on their timber at the capital gains tax rate of 25 percent,

rather than the straight corporation tax rate of 52 percent.

TAXES TAKE 31 PERCENT

Swindells leaned forward, looking through steel-rimmed glasses for your acceptance of what he was saying, speaking in a voice so big it surprises you: "If you sold your timber outright, you paid a flat 25 percent of the profit in taxes, capital gains taxes," he said patiently, "plus 6 percent to the State * * * which makes 31 percent."

"An extreme example. You have some \$10 timber you cut, basing the sale on today's market value of \$43 a thousand. So you have approximately \$33 profit and you pay approximately one-third of that in taxes."

"But to replace that timber, to get it back into your timber inventory, costs you \$43 a thousand, the market value. So you have got to take the one-third you paid in taxes out of your earnings. Under normal, full 52-percent corporation taxes, you would have 52 percent to make up to replace your timber, and the earnings will not support 52 percent."

Swindells' companies have been replacing 50 million feet a year. "Our timber in fee is the same today as it was in 1950," he said. "We have never had enough timber here to be on a sustained-yield basis, so we have had to replace our timber at timber sales."

Without the capital gains provision allowing that extra profit on the company's timber, Swindells said, this could not be continued as a company policy. "At the present retail price of timber, the profit margin is so small, it would not pay to continue operation. The alternative," he added bluntly, "would be to discontinue business."

BYPRODUCTS PROVE LIFESAVER

But capital gains on timber have also left enough money in the timber operators' hands to build the timber inventory needed for complete utilization, the wood fiberboard plant, scheduled for a 60-percent expansion, the kraft plant, taking on an additional \$3.8 million paper machine. This is the money, he said, that has kept the industry in business, giving us the raw material base to back up the industrial expansion.

"So some guy says, 'You have been able to build up a pretty nice empire out of that money you have retained,' he said, phrasing the obvious criticism.

"But ask yourself what has this money done for the country," and he began to illustrate.

The Swindells companies employ approximately 3,000, some 80 percent of them in Oregon. "Our particle board plant uses 7,500 units of shavings a month. Western Kraft uses 13,000 units of chips a month and we have every reason to believe that by the end of 1963, we will be able to use our sawdust in a product of vast potential."

Swindells pointed to what this market for waste materials mean to the small private operator. "It gives him a market for his chips and shavings, permits him to practice good utilization. He could not practice good utilization without these plants. Dallas would be a ghost town today without the capital gains provisions."

But more important to this region, he said, are the forestry practices the capital gains provision created in the woods of Oregon and Washington and California.

"You cannot practice good forestry unless you have complete utilization. And you must have the incentive to grow trees in the face of risks like the Columbus Day storm, fires, and maintenance to practice good forestry. * * * These are all calculated risks and then we figure we have this capital gains waiting at the end of the line to pay for it."

"To make an investment like this you cannot think in terms of less than 50 to 90 years. You started out on the basis of capital gains 20 years ago. Now you knock it off. It will create financial uncertainty."

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2091

Now, suddenly, instead of getting help and assurances, the exiles found themselves facing obstacles and threats of arrest.

To many Americans, the seeming reversal of U.S. policy came as a surprise—and a puzzle.

People asked: Why? What is the Kennedy administration trying to do?

On April 3, at a news conference, President Kennedy gave his explanation.

What the President's words boil down to is this: The United States is trying to avoid trouble with Russia that might raise a new threat of war.

HIT: RUSSIAN SHIPS

Cuban exiles, in recent weeks, had begun a new type of campaign. Instead of striking only at Castro, they began attacking Russian merchant ships that supply Castro.

On March 17, one group of exiles raided the Cuban port of Isabela de Sagua and fired on the Soviet freighter *Lvov*. Afterward, at a news conference in Washington, they boasted that they had also gone ashore at Isabela de Sagua and fought a 45-minute gun battle with Russian soldiers.

Ten days later, on March 27, another group of exiles raced a 22-foot speedboat into the port of Calhárén, on Cuba's northern coast.

Tony Cuesta, military leader of the group—known as Commando L—told U.S. News & World Report this story of that attack:

The raiders sped right for the biggest ship in port—the Soviet freighter *Baku*. They fired machineguns and 20-millimeter cannons at the *Baku* as they approached.

Then the raiders pulled alongside and pasted a 50-pound charge of plastic explosive to the Russian ship. They covered this operation by throwing hand grenades onto the *Baku's* deck.

As they raced away, toward the open sea, the plastic charge exploded.

Later, from a Cuban broadcast, the raiders learned: Their charge had torn an 18-foot hole in the side of the Soviet ship, and 10,000 sacks of sugar destined for Russia were destroyed by the sea water that rushed into the breach.

IRE IN MOSCOW

The raids drew an angry protest from Moscow. The Russians charged the United States with full responsibility. They said the United States, by tolerating such raids, "is actually bringing about a dangerous situation in the area of the Caribbean Sea and throughout the world."

The danger of the situation was demonstrated on March 28. Two of Castro's Russian-built Mig jet planes fired cannon shots across the bow of an American motor ship, the *Floridian*, in international waters off the coast of Cuba.

On April 2, Castro apologized to the United States, said the shooting was a mistake. But the implication was clear: The Communists would shoot at American ships if exile attacks continued.

On April 3, with the crackdown in force, the U.S. State Department was able to tell Russia that "every step necessary" was being taken to insure that such attacks are not "launched, manned, or equipped from U.S. territory."

Did this mean that all exile attacks on Castro's Cuba and Communist ships are going to cease?

Talk to the exile leaders in Miami and the answer you get is, "No." They concede that the new crackdown will make it more difficult to supply some types of operations. But they insist the raids will go on.

In fact, some say, the raids will increase because the raiding force is growing, with enough men, boats and arms spread through the Caribbean to mount a continuing campaign.

Raiders insist that they do not attack from bases in the United States, but from bases

in the Caribbean, outside of America's territorial waters.

Those bases, the raiders say, are small, uninhabited islands—perhaps just a sand-spit—where raiders take shelter for a day or so and then move on.

Sometimes, raiders claim, they even use islands that belong to Cuba.

The raiders point out that there are thousands of tiny islands in the Caribbean and that it would be impossible for any country to police them all effectively.

How, then, did the British find that raiding boat—called the *Violynn III*—which they captured in the Bahamas on March 31?

That story was told by Jerry Buchanan, a 24-year-old American adventurer who sailed aboard the boat with 16 Cubans. He said the *Violynn III* was followed by a U.S. Navy plane for nearly 2 days and then, when it put in at Norman Cay to refuel, Bahamian police were waiting—"They knew all about us."

A State Department spokesman admitted the information on which the British acted "was provided to British authorities by the United States."

This illustrates the change in U.S. policy: The owner of the *Violynn III* said the craft had been used before on secret missions to Cuba—sometimes with advance knowledge of U.S. authorities.

It has been the attacks on Russian ships that have stirred the U.S. Government into action against the exiles.

This campaign has been growing, and some exile leaders consider it important. The idea in these attacks is to cut off Castro's supplies by knocking out as many Communist supply ships as possible and scaring off neutral ships.

Said one exile leader, Tony Cuesta: "Cuba cannot live without supplies from abroad—particularly oil. Therefore, if we can destroy enough shipping to scare most of the rest away, Castro dies of starvation."

WE ARE INVISIBLE

How can the exiles, with only small boats and light guns, hope for much success against Castro's strong coastal defenses?

Mr. Cuesta explained:

"Our advantage is that we are the invisible enemy. We have no bases they can attack. Our main weapon is the small, fast boat. It is hard for radar to spot. Once in the shallow water near shore, we operate at our best—we are the masters. Right now we fight only at night. Later we will operate in daylight, too."

Yet, to many exile leaders, the attacks on ships are less important than the other mission of raiding boats—the infiltration of Cuba from the sea.

Objectives of the infiltrations are to deliver arms to resistance groups inside Cuba, to land guerrilla fighters and saboteurs on Cuban soil, to gather intelligence information, and to take out anti-Castro Cubans who want to escape from Cuba.

Such activities as these, the exiles say, have always been encouraged by U.S. authorities.

In New York, on April 2, it was reported that more than a score of American college students have been using their weekends and vacations to take part in at least 15 such missions to Cuba.

Alexander I. Rorke, Jr., the owner of the *Violynn III*, made the disclosure in an interview on a television broadcast by the American Broadcasting Co. He identified himself as leader of a group of Americans supplying arms to the anti-Castro underground. But he insisted the arms were not shipped into or out of the United States, so that no American laws were violated.

SHACKLES—AND BITTERNESS

In spite of their determination to continue their raids—and their predictions of future success—most anti-Castro Cuban

leaders in Miami are bitter about the new shackles placed on them by the country that had previously encouraged them to fight.

One exile leader, Luis Conte Agüero, called the new U.S. policy "an anti-Monroe Doctrine." He said it puts the United States "in the incredible position of protecting the Russians in Cuba."

In Congress, the new crackdown provoked controversy, with opinions divided—some lawmakers defending and others criticizing the administration's policy.

In the debate, one subject kept popping up. That subject was the continued presence of Russian troops in Cuba.

MR. KENNEDY'S HOPE

President Kennedy was asked about this at his April 3 news conference.

The President said it was estimated that there were about 21,000 or 22,000 Russian troops in Cuba last October, at the time of the missile crisis. He said evidence indicated that about 5,000 Russians left Cuba last November and approximately 4,000 left last month.

This would indicate about 12,000 or 13,000 Russian troops remaining in Cuba.

"We hope they are going to be withdrawn," the President said. He did not say what the United States would do if the troops were not withdrawn.

One thing that Mr. Kennedy made clear, however, was this: He thinks the chances of getting Nikita Khrushchev to pull his troops out of Cuba are going to be a lot better if the U.S. Government can stop the Cuban refugees from shooting up Russian ships.

The Unthinkables

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, a current issue of National Review contains an article that caught my interest since it points up our seeming strange official attitude toward what amounts to a bandit in our backyard. The article is extremely brief but its impact will certainly be lasting. I commend it to my colleagues for informative reading.

The article follows:

THE UNTHINKABLES—GANGBUSTERS ON THE NEW FRONTIER

(By Victor Gold)

MARCH 15, 1934.

To All Members, Department of Police, City of Chicago:

Your attention is directed to increased partisan hectoring regarding the Dillinger file. Basic department policy in this area is contained in white paper, January 17, 1934, "Has Dillinger Betrayed His Revolution?" Nevertheless, growing civic unrest, fanned by irate-wing extremists, makes further clarification necessary:

1. The Dillinger gang is under constant surveillance. Its community prestige, according to department surveys, is at an all-time low. Its economic affairs are in serious disarray.

2. Department experts assess Dillinger's total ballistic capability at 7 second-hand Thompson submachineguns, 12 old-model Smith & Wesson .45 caliber pistols, 5 obsolete Colt .32 caliber automatics, and 3 bulletproof vests of doubtful value. In the absence of howitzers and other long-

range cannon—removed last month following department demands that area zoning ordinances be observed—this arsenal is properly classified defensive in nature.

3. Your department has at its disposal approximately 1,200 police officers, 5,000 small arms of the very latest design, 50 Thompson submachineguns just in from the factory and an overwhelming weapons superiority provided by National Guard Reserves. Viewing the Dillinger problem in this perspective, it is little short of ridiculous to assume that city hall is in danger of attack.

PROPER WARNING

4. Of course, it is always possible that city hall could be attacked. Anything is possible. Your department is alert to this possibility, however, and has duly warned Dillinger that such an attack would represent the gravest of threats to community law and order.

5. Department strategy takes into account growing evidence that the gang is no longer monolithic in structure. Underworld intelligence reports confirm that Dillinger and "Baby Face" Nelson, between fusillades at police officers, hardly speak to each other.

6. Contrary to rumors circulating State Street, your department was under no pledge, promise or obligation to furnish roof cover for citizen vigilantes during their recent abortive assault on Dillinger headquarters.

7. Finally, your department remains convinced that the only real answer to the threat of Dillinger and Dillingerism lies in an expanded economic development program for the affected neighborhood. While we acknowledge some difficulty in locating risk capital investors for new projects, there is no satisfactory alternative in a modern civilized age. A police stake-out and full-dress attack, with its concomitant violence and decline in neighborhood property values, is unthinkable.

8. Should the inquiring citizen persist in his hectoring, advise him to take a 50-mile hike to let off steam. If nothing else, it will put him in Peoria police jurisdiction.

Meaningless Objective: Growth Statistics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, economic growth to many Government planners means merely inflated, hollow statistics rather than increased investment and healthy production. Growth statistics such as GNP can be artificially produced and are by themselves meaningless except for use for deceptive political claims.

A sound economy promises us the only real growth—not false gimmicks to bolster up the statistics.

"The Growth Obsession" is from the Wall Street Journal:

THE GROWTH OBSESSION

The speakers at a recent symposium—the President, the Secretary of the Treasury, bankers, businessmen, and academic economists—offered widely different prescriptions to achieve this growth. Some prescribed big tax cuts in various doses. Others plumped for bigger Government spending. Some asked for both together. There were even an old-fashioned few who argued the need for less Government spending.

But with a lone exception, all the speakers were agreed on one thing. What ails us is

not enough growth, and growth in large quantities is what the economy must have at any price. Indeed, this was the premise imbedded in the title of this symposium sponsored by the American Bankers Association.

It is in fact a very simple matter to stimulate growth in the economy as it is commonly measured. The gross national product, which was the yardstick used by almost every speaker, can be increased by anything that will increase the turnover of money. Increased Government spending will increase the statistic regardless of what the money is spent for. So will increased private spending; let the people once doubt the future value of their money, and their rush to spend present dollars would shoot the GNP up to the sky.

It's no great trick, either, for this country to increase production statistics. The Government's farm program has increased agricultural production to the point where we don't know what to do with it all. The same could be done with the steel industry if the only point were to make more steel ingots. The unemployment statistic can be made to drop by any one of a number of devices, ranging from make-work to simply putting all the unemployed on the Government payroll.

The ridiculousness of these suggestions is merely a reminder that it is not growth, of and for itself, that we want.

Indeed, one of the ills we now suffer from, as the farm program well illustrates, is that artificial stimulants have been applied to some parts of the economy so that they have grown out of all proportion to the rest of the body or to any need at all, and this wild growth is putting undue strain on the whole body economic.

If we can agree on policies that will give us a sound economy, it is possible that they may not cause much immediate growth; indeed, almost by definition they will not in any segments of the economy which are already overgrown. It is even possible that healthy policies may not result in great future growth, although we doubt it because we don't believe in the gloomy view that ours is a mature economy with all its growth in the past.

But only by searching for sound policies can we possibly hope to achieve any real growth. Approaching the problem as if growth were all there is to talk about, and a thing to be bought at any price, is to mistake the task.

Guatemala Takeover Is a Racket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, a very penetrating and thoughtful article appeared in the Washington Daily News on Thursday, April 4, 1963, under the caption "Guatemala Takeover Is a Racket." This article was written by Richard H. Boyce, dated in San Salvador, and followed within a few days after he departed Guatemala where he observed the overthrow of the Ydigoras government by a military coup.

Mr. Boyce has done an outstanding job in exposing the manner in which the military forces in many Latin American countries are tied in with the 2 per-centers who own everything and use the

combination of the two forces to prevent the blooming of a truly popular and representative government.

I would add only one point which may have escaped the attention of Mr. Boyce. One of the candidates for the presidency in the free elections that were scheduled to be held before the military coup was Col. Jose Luis Cruz-Salazar, a career military officer in Guatemala and former Guatemalan Ambassador to the United States. It is interesting to observe that Colonel Cruz-Salazar was in the United States on February 27, 1963, and appeared before the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Affairs as a witness on the subject of Castro Communist subversion in the Western Hemisphere. It is fair to inquire whether Colonel Cruz-Salazar is in any way involved in the military coup which just took place in Guatemala and the extent to which this coup d'etat has improved his chances of succeeding President Ydigoras in an election that could hardly be described as democratic when conducted by the military group now in power. A prudent concern for the future and the rights of the poor peasants of Guatemala—three-fourths of whom are illiterate—who are paying the price for the shocking "protection" provided by the military coup, requires an answer to this question before the U.S. Government takes any action in regard to the mysterious events which have just taken place in Guatemala.

Under previous permission, I include Mr. Boyce's article in the RECORD:

GUATEMALA TAKEOVER IS A RACKET

(By Richard H. Boyce)

SAN SALVADOR, EL SALVADOR, April 4.—The military takeover in Guatemala is nothing but a protection racket, Chicago-gangster style of the 1930's.

And it is the poor peasants of Guatemala—three-fourths of them illiterate—who are paying the price of this awful protection.

The army's contention that it was necessary to unseat President Miguel Ydigoras Fuentes because he was "complacent" toward communism's threats to the government is hard to swallow.

Senor Ydigoras may have been corrupt as some charged. But he also was one of the most vocal anti-Communist in the hemisphere. He permitted the 1961 Bay of Pigs anti-Castro invaders to train in Guatemala.

He was a legally elected President.

QUESTIONS

Is a totalitarian police state created by army tanks and guns any more democratic than a Communist government? To replace Senor Ydigoras by force is to use the very weapon the Guatemalan Army, under strongman Enrique Peralta, cries loudest against.

For months army elements have been trying to arrange a coup in Guatemala.

As far back as last November, certain army officers went to Senor Peralta, then Defense Minister and, as such, army commander in chief. They sought his support in overthrowing Ydigoras and creating a three-man junta. Senor Peralta would become the next President, these officers assured him. Senor Peralta refused then.

PRESSURE

But pressure on him continued, then mounted as Juan Jose Arevalo vividly came into the picture. Senor Arevalo is a former Guatemalan President (1945-50), branded a

A2086

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

April 8

CHURCH GROWTH

During the 18 years of Dr. Landes' ministry in Wichita Falls, there have been 9,941 members added to First Baptist with 2,675 of them by baptism. Six missions have been established, with three of them already self-supporting.

Sunday school enrollment has increased from 1,852 to 3,432 and training union from 294 to 1,132. The church has nine graded choirs in addition to the sanctuary choir, which last year sang before the Baptist General Convention of Texas.

Budget of the church has grown from \$56,000 in 1945 to \$395,000 for 1963. Value of church property now stands at \$2,436,170.

Test Ban Report Attacked

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to take this opportunity to insert at this point a letter to the editor which appeared in today's New York Times. The letter is from the Honorable James J. Wadsworth, a highly respected and responsible member of the Republican Party, who has devoted much of his life to service to the Government of the United States, and who, as a result of his past and current association with the United Nations, is certainly in a position to judge the efforts underway to effect a nuclear test ban treaty.

His letter is set forth herewith:

TEST-BAN REPORT ATTACKED—WADSWORTH
DENIES PANEL SPEAKS FOR ALL HOUSE
REPUBLICANS

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Critics of the protracted efforts to achieve a nuclear test-ban treaty with the Russians have been most outspoken since the chances of agreement seemed to improve in the wake of the Cuban crisis. These critics are to be found in both parties, as are the consistent advocates of a workable treaty. Unfortunately, however, the Republican leadership in the House has left the impression that the GOP as a whole opposes the administration's current test-ban policy.

This impression has been left by Representative CRAIG HOSMER's Republican House Panel on Nuclear Testing, whose reports are signed by the entire GOP leadership. The panel's first report, presumably based on the views of "experts" whose anti-test-ban views were already well known, was released to the press before scientists with a different approach could be heard.

Not surprisingly, the first report concluded that "the present basis for negotiations on detection machinery fails to offer realistic probability of detecting violations." Yet it was not until almost a month later that Government witnesses spelled out the areas of recent progress in underground test detection before the hearings of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Anyone seriously interested in the facts could hardly be in a position to judge the detection machinery without hearing from the men most closely associated with making it work.

UNDERGROUND EXPLOSIONS

Now the hearings are over and Mr. Hosmer's panel has issued another report.

This time the panel has seized upon one bit of testimony, carefully ignored other statements, and has come to the conclusion that the American-British detection system cannot detect small underground nuclear tests over an area of 2.5 million square miles in the U.S.S.R.

The Hosmer panel's calculations are based on the assumption that secret Soviet tests would be conducted in dry alluvium, a soft earth. But the panel ignored the testimony of Dr. Franklin Long of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, who indicated that there are only two small areas of alluvium in the U.S.S.R. One is on the Iranian and Afghan borders, the other about 400 miles from Iran. Both are within detection range of stations outside of the U.S.S.R.

As a Republican and as the former chief negotiator for the Eisenhower administration, which initiated the nuclear test-ban talks, I find the operation of the Hosmer panel one of the most unfortunate domestic developments since I served in Geneva. It is biased in its presentation of the argument and misleading in its pretense of speaking for all House Republicans. I feel sure that the panel does not reflect the views of all Republicans in the House and certainly in the Senate, which must ultimately ratify any treaty which is signed.

BASIS FOR NEGOTIATIONS

Some Congressional and press attacks on continued efforts to reach agreement imply that the top officials of the administration and their negotiators are "giving away" our national security, piece by piece. Level-headed Americans know that successful negotiations must be based on a structure of mutual advantages for both sides. A workable nuclear test ban—and further steps toward mutual disarmament—would improve the security of both major powers as well as all other nations.

If this administration is guilty of anything, it is the failure to educate the public to the comparative risks of continued testing versus a treaty. President Kennedy made a cogent point during his press conference of March 21 when he spoke of the probability that many more nations would have the nuclear weapon by the midseventies. I hope he will continue to voice this warning until it is well understood. When the public is made aware of the choice we face, it can intelligently weigh the risks of new paths of international security.

JAMES J. WADSWORTH.

Tragedy in Our Policy Toward Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, last week in the RECORD I predicted that this administration would line up with Castro and Khrushchev against the patriot Cuban exiles. I did this merely by gaging future conduct by past performance of President Kennedy. Sure enough we are now implementing that policy. Instead of proclaiming and prosecuting violation of our hemisphere by Khrushchev and international communism we are aiding and abetting puppet Castro and big boss Khrushchev at the expense of Cuban patriots in and out of Cuba. Where now is hope for the Cubans under communism's terroristic, police state control?

President Kennedy campaigned promising to liberate Cuba from communism. Then he promised Khrushchev and Castro not to even attack Cuba. President Kennedy declared a quarantine but did not follow through. Mr. Khrushchev declared the heavy arms shipments to Cuba were not offensive weapons. The President parroted these words then was forced to repudiate his own statements. The President finally admitted Khrushchev was running the show. Last week the President admitted he knew there were 22,000 Russian troops in Cuba last year, yet never confided in our people. On TV last year the President discussed as just learned a missile buildup yet we know now from testimony that the administration knew these facts weeks before.

The Cubans maintain that this country promised air support and help in the abortive invasion and since then we have heard numerous versions including the President's brother's statement that we never promised such aid. What can we believe?

What now happens to the exiled Cubans and those under Khrushchev and Castro's iron heel? What happens to other people in captive nations? Are we forsaking Latin and South America? Have we abandoned any semblance of toughness or dedication to principle, any principle, in our world confrontation of a Communist system dedicated to burying us? Are we yellow? Are we scared? Of course not. Yet our posture of vacillation, doubletalk, repudiation, and weakness may tempt some foolhardy unknowing foreign nation to test us.

Is it possible that our leaders do not know the moral fiber, the toughness, the steadfastness of American people who expect the same of their leaders? The managed news controversy suggests that the President does not know and underestimates the need for and the capacity of the understanding of American people.

The new "neutralism" by David Lawrence is both timely and prophetic. The path to war is the path of weakness not strength. Let us hope the President and his advisers, and congressional leaders get the message.

THE NEW "NEUTRALISM"

(By David Lawrence)

Maybe we ought to apologize for any past expressions implying disagreement with the "neutralism" of various governments in Asia and Africa.

Maybe we should forget all that our spokesmen have said heretofore in support of the right of peoples anywhere to seek by revolution to free themselves from the yoke of autocratic rulers.

Maybe we should explain that it is considered expedient now not to offend Khrushchev, though he strives through international communism to dominate the world.

Maybe all democracies are expected now to remain neutral and to restrain Cubans from returning to their homeland to fight for the freedom of their countrymen.

Maybe we should erase from history books the chapters on the American Revolution wherein our forefathers pledged "our lives our fortunes, and our sacred honor" to gain independence from tyranny.

For what else does it mean when the President of the United States orders exiled Cubans to be arrested and imprisoned if they take any steps while inside this country to

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2085

Kenny, his wife, and their six children became national celebrities almost overnight.

On March 8, the Kennys arrived at New York International Airport where they were greeted by a pipers' band, a color guard and hundreds of residents of Jersey City, including city officials. Five nights later, more than 1,000 citizens of many national backgrounds honored the visitors from Dublin at a testimonial dinner.

The big parade on March 17 will be talked about for a long time in Jersey City. Garda Kenny marched out front in his Civic Guard uniform, the first time in history that a member of his police unit was wearing the uniform with official permission outside Dublin.

Pinned to his left lapel was a gold badge which had been presented to him at the testimonial dinner by Mayor Gangemi bearing the inscription "Honorary Chief of Police, City of Jersey City, New Jersey, U.S.A."

On March 19, Garda Kenny and Mrs. Kenny came to Washington, D.C., where they met many Members of the Congress. I am grateful to the Vice President for the gracious hospitality he extended to our visitors from Dublin and a delegation from Jersey City. It was my privilege to introduce these friends, including Mrs. Scanlan who worked so hard to make this event a success.

Our distinguished Speaker also made time in his busy schedule to extend his warm welcome. He was, as always, exceedingly gracious and once again he evidenced a truly great knowledge of Irish history and revealed many Irish traditions well remembered by those of Irish descent in this country, but unfamiliar to many native Irish.

I am indeed grateful to the Speaker for his kindness.

The Kennys have returned to Ireland. Their visit will be long remembered. The St. Patrick's Day celebration was truly a fine event that fully expressed a fine civic pride and a genuine feeling of brotherhood.

It would be difficult to commend all who worked toward the success of the great event. But special mention should be made of Mrs. Scanlon, Warren Murphy, John Thompson, and John Hunt, all of Jersey City.

The following are two editorials that appeared in the Jersey Journal, commenting on the wonderful affair and the good that it brought on both sides of the Atlantic.

So Long, P.J.

Constable and Mrs. Patrick J. Kenny go home tomorrow. All of us brushed by their magic in the past 3 weeks give them back reluctantly to their eagerly waiting six children and the Emerald Isle which owes them a heroes' welcome.

For they leave behind them a wonderfully refreshing spirit which captivated all of us and became a prevailing mood at the most successful, and first municipally sponsored St. Patrick's Day parade in Jersey City's history.

We hope P.J. and his lady return to Dublin with the same feelings about us. Our welcome mat will always be out for P.J., Nancy, and the kids. We bid them "so long" and we hope they come back—soon and often.

THE BIG PARADE

Wasn't that a day, though. For a town which had never had a citywide St. Patrick's Day parade, Jersey City certainly started with a bang. Thousands of marchers and a hundred thousand or more watchers made it the most colorful holiday the city ever has given itself.

It was a happy day all day. Even the sun seemed to be having fun upsetting those forecasters who assured us all the night before that we would be showered with rain and buffeted by winds. There was neither.

It was more than a great day for the Irish, more than a roaring public welcome for Constable P. J. Kenny and Nancy (although they were cheered from end to end of the march) it was more than a parade, more even than a tribute to the great Saint. It encompassed and transcended all those things. It was a kind of spontaneous outcry against talk of abominations, a sort of "Let's show the world Jersey City can do things right." And it did.

It was a wholesome day. It was a day when everyone in the city, for a change, was on the same side. Those who might otherwise be harpooning each other for some political purpose, were slapping each other on the back and saying how fine the parade was. Yet, it can be quite a town when everyone gets on the same side.

It was a day no one wanted to see end from Bishop Stanton, standing for hours on the reviewing platform, to the youngsters waving their green and gold banners.

It was the kind of day that should come again, now that we have seen how it can be done, how the whole town can turn out just for the sheer joy of expressing good will. It was the kind of day that makes one ask: "Why don't we do this more often?"

And why don't we?

City Invited to Landes Reception

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, Wichita Falls, Tex., said farewell Sunday to one of its most outstanding families. Dr. James H. Landes, minister of the First Baptist Church for the past 18 years, preached his last sermon in Wichita Falls Sunday morning. This week he is assuming new duties as president of Hardin-Simmons University in Abilene, Tex. Dr. and Mrs. Landes and their daughter, Ruth, have been among the most highly respected and deeply loved members of our community. We will miss them but wish them well in their new home.

Following is an article which appeared in the March 31 edition of the Wichita Falls Times about the Landes family, the recognition given them by the community and the wonderful record of their service to our city:

City Invited to Landes Reception

Members of many faiths and all walks of life join today in paying tribute and bidding Godspeed to two of the city's best-loved residents, Dr. and Mrs. James H. Landes.

Designated "James H. Landes Day" by official proclamation of Mayor John J. Gavin, Sunday marks the close of an 18-year pastorate of Dr. Landes at First Baptist Church.

He will leave early in the week to assume his duties as new president of Hardin-Simmons University, Abilene.

Climax to Sunday's observance of "Landes Day" will be an appreciation service at 6:50 p.m. in First Baptist, followed by a public reception there at 8 o'clock.

To open the day's tribute all Sunday school classes at First Baptist are striving for an unusually high attendance.

Dr. Landes will deliver his final sermon as pastor of First Baptist Church at the Sunday morning worship service.

In his proclamation honoring Dr. Landes, Mayor Gavin urges that all our people express appreciation for his great Christian example by attending the church of their choice Sunday.

Leadership of Dr. Landes has extended into all facets of community life, and his personal touch has been felt by people of all faiths.

President of the Baptist General Association of Texas for the last 2 years, Dr. Landes is respected as a dynamic preacher of the Gospel and an efficient organizer and administrator throughout the entire Southern Baptist Convention.

He probably is the best known Baptist preacher today in Texas and one of the top leaders of that church throughout the entire South.

Despite his full schedule of activities in Baptist life throughout the city, State, and South, the personable minister has found time to take part in practically all worthwhile community endeavors and also for visits not only to the sick and troubled of his own congregation; but also those among his wide circle of friends in other denominations.

SILVER LEVER

Dr. Landes in 1961 was presented the Silver Beaver Award by the Boy Scouts of America for distinguished service to boyhood.

He has served twice as president of the Wichita Falls Ministerial Alliance, director of the Knife and Fork Club, chairman of the Executive Board of the General Baptist Convention of Texas, and as a member of the boards of the chamber of commerce, citizens' planning committee, American Red Cross, Boy Scouts, Young Men's Christian Association, Salvation Army, Boy's Clubs of America, Community Chest, UESO, civic music, child welfare, mental health and united fund.

He has delivered the annual sermon for the Southern Baptist Association and the Baptist General Convention of Texas and has been featured speaker on the telecast "Frontiers of Faith." In 1961 a sermon he delivered in Wichita Falls was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

WIFE AND DAUGHTER

In 1955 the minister attended the Baptist World Alliance in London and toured the Holy Land. He also attended the Baptist World Congress in Copenhagen, Denmark.

For several years he preached at the cowboy camp meeting in the Davis Mountains.

Mrs. Landes has filled an equally busy spot in the community life and has been a leader in many endeavors in addition to carrying out to the fullest her role as a busy minister's wife. Like her husband, she numbers a host of friends in all faiths and all walks of life.

For many years she was a board member of the women's missionary union State executive board, and has been active in the Young Women's Christian Association, musicians club, and the women's forum. She is a member of P.M.B. Kappa.

The Landeses have one child, a daughter, Ruth, who is now Mrs. Bill Pitts. She has completed all work except her dissertation for a doctorate from George Peabody College and is at present a college teacher in Nashville, Tenn. Her husband is doing graduate work at Vanderbilt University.

A talented musician, Mrs. Pitts won many honors at Wichita Falls High School and Baylor University.

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2087

help organize military expeditions of their own people to go back to rescue their fellow citizens?

Mr. Kennedy said to his news conference the other day that such raids are ineffective and could cause international complications for us. There are even hints that the great Government of the United States is afraid to hurt the feelings of Khrushchev and thus give him an excuse either to halt the withdrawal of the remainder of the Soviet Army now stationed in Cuba or even to send in additional forces.

But since when is the policy of the United States based on fear of a tyrant instead of on fundamental principles of international justice?

The President can call the raids ineffective, and they might indeed fail for the time being. But, realistically, they symbolize the spirit of revolution—the sacrifices that patriots are ready to make for their country's freedom.

Why are we being commanded to stay neutral when human liberty is at stake and brave men are willing to die for such a cause? Is this the time for us to appear before all the world as having intervened to protect Castro and the Soviet Army in Cuba?

Why does the President invoke neutrality laws against the expeditions of patriotic Cubans? Didn't the Soviet Government send in an army of 22,000 troops and technicians and erect missile bases aimed at our coastline from an island 90 miles away? What kind of neutrality has Khrushchev observed?

Why do we tear to shreds the historic Monroe Doctrine, which for nearly 140 years has been a cardinal policy of the United States?

President Monroe announced to the world in 1823 that we would not let European powers "extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere" or control any government except in colonies they already possessed. But today we allow the Soviet system to establish and maintain itself in Cuba by the dominance of military force. We set an example for the nations of the world, including the Latin American countries. We tell them, in effect, they must not permit their territory or their resources to be used to aid the revolutionary movement in Cuba.

This is "neutrality" with a vengeance.

This is alignment on the side of the cruel dictators.

This is official indifference to the cause of freedom.

What shall we say now to the captive peoples of Eastern Europe? Shall we squelch all the organizations inside countries where refuge is given to "exile governments" and where bands of patriots send word constantly by radio and otherwise to their countrymen that the free world hasn't forgotten them?

The President's action in depriving exiled Cubans of the opportunity to deliver their own people from human bondage has sent a chill of dismay through the hearts of freedom-loving people everywhere.

The view is expressed, moreover, inside official Washington that we must not annoy Khrushchev. In other words, supposedly to avoid a big war, we must appease the Hitlers of our day.

But sad experience tells us that this is the very way wars are brought on. Dictators misconstrue pacifism for cowardice. They then take chances and intensify their acts of aggression. As Winston Churchill wrote after World War II:

"Still, if you will not fight for the right when you can easily win without bloodshed; if you will not fight when your victory will be sure and not too costly; you may come to the moment when you will have to fight with all the odds against you and only a precarious chance for survival.

"There may even be a worse case. You may have to fight when there is no hope of victory, because it is better to perish than live as slaves."

The new "neutrality" is a most dangerous development in our foreign policy. It could ultimately plunge us into the big war nobody wants.

Tribute to a Great Lady

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, tributes to one of America's greatest leaders continue to appear. I refer, of course, to the tributes to Eleanor Roosevelt who died last November. I ask unanimous consent to have a sensitive, warm article by Katie S. Louchheim, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs, which appeared in the March 1963 newsletter of the Department of State, to be placed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

TRIBUTE TO A GREAT LADY

(By Katie S. Louchheim)

(Note.—When Mrs. Roosevelt died on November 7, it was a great personal loss to Mrs. Louchheim who had known and admired her for many years.)

The chairman of the United Nations Day celebration had just introduced Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt as "the first lady of the free world."

"The audience," said a newspaper account, "gave Mrs. Roosevelt a standing ovation."

Such an outpouring of affection and esteem greeted her wherever she spoke in small and large halls, in all parts of America, and in faraway places around the globe. She was, in a word, revered in her own time.

Her generosity with her time was prodigious. She seldom refused a plea for an appearance. Her remarks, delivered in that simple understated eloquence would reach out to everyone in the room. Her audiences invariably left determined to follow her precepts: "remember that what each one of us does in each community is a sign to other people watching us all over the world; this, they say, is what you mean by Democracy." Then she would add: "This country must accept a Soviet challenge and become a showcase for what can be done by free men for the individual."

Her name headed so many lists. When we needed her—and all of us needed her in so many ways—she was there to inspire and guide and light those "candles in the dark."

She was the first always to go to the trouble spots and the first to insist on practical answers to probing questions. She combined idealism with practicality in a unique American way. Because of her effective concern for her fellow man and woman, she became the peace settler for all of us. We are all her beneficiaries. Because of her leadership, we can truthfully say that our friends throughout the world today regard the American woman's contribution as significant and constructive. Because of her example, we have all attempted to keep the pace she set for us.

Sometimes the pace in its literal sense—just keeping up with her—catching her from plane to speech, or from meeting hall to next appointment was a frighteningly fast one. I can recall many occasions when she left me breathless, pursuing her up the steps of a

hotel, on my way to escort her to her waiting car, or to the airport. She was always ahead of me and yet always willing to share her precious moments between engagements. She took the time to hear my explanations when I wanted her help or advice. And she invariably gave both with that gentle firmness that assured a genuine interest, a kindness that was never hurried or curtailed.

I recall very clearly the first time I saw her at close hand. We were working in the women's division of the Democratic headquarters in the 1940 campaign. She came to pay us an "encouraging call." She stopped at every desk to talk. Commenting on the work at hand, she moved on leaving a delighted volunteer behind.

Right after election, President Roosevelt invited all the workers to the White House so he could personally thank us. The invitation, we were certain, came to us at Mrs. Roosevelt's suggestion.

The President received us informally, chatting with each one of us as we shook hands with him. Later Mrs. Roosevelt took us to the East Room to show us the new piano. "The President was not really interested in the quality of the instrument," she told us, smiling, "but in the eagle pedestal—being an ornithologist he wanted to be certain the details were quite correct."

In recent years, I had many occasions to talk with her about the opportunities for women to be of service. She believed in women's contribution and never ceased to seek new ways in which women volunteers could be used, or in which the social injustices to women could be resolved and new doors could be opened to them professionally.

She would remind us, by recounting her own experiences, of the responsibilities all women in public life faced. In her autobiography, describing her participation as the only woman in the delegation to the London meeting to set up the first General Assembly of the U.N., she says:

"I was not very welcome. Moreover, if I failed to be a useful member it would not be considered merely that I as an individual had failed but that all women had failed. There would be little chance for others to serve in the near future."

All of us have heard her express these warning sentiments on many occasions. In a "Person to Person" interview with Edward R. Murrow, she said: "A woman must do well, or she hurts all women."

She more than lived up to her own warning. Whatever she did, she did well, graciously, modestly, and with distinction. And what she did helped all women.

The last time I saw her was at a meeting of the Commission on the Status of Women at which she presided. I had come to tell the Commission about a recent trip to Japan and how on countless occasions in meetings with Japanese women leaders, they had expressed admiration for President Kennedy in creating this body; and great hopes in the accomplishment of its objectives.

Mrs. Roosevelt made a point of asking me whether the young bride in Japan was still "dominated" by her mother-in-law. This situation had troubled her when she had last visited that country. I assured her many of these traditional mores were changing. Feelingly she said: "I hope so."

Afterwards, I told her of an evening in Osaka with a group of Japanese professional women. They sought my advice. Would they be more effective if they took on more aggressive manners, raised their voices in debate, insisted more forcibly and loudly on their rights?

"No, by no means," I replied and went on to say that all of the women in my country who had succeeded in persuading others to their cause had retained their femininity, and their approach had always been reasonable and gentle. As a perfect illustration of my thesis, I had reminded them of Mrs.

A2088

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

April 8

Roosevelt. They had nodded approvingly and thanked me for reassuring them. Nothing would please them more than to follow in Mrs. Roosevelt's footsteps.

Mrs. Roosevelt listened and gave me one of those delightfully half-amused smiles. It seemed to say, "If I have helped, if what I have done has inspired others, that was precisely what I intended to do with my life."

East-West Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, within recent months the Atlantic Alliance has had to weather a series of storms. We have found that we and our allies do not always agree on the means to meet the Soviet military threat, nor how to deal with the Russians on the diplomatic level. Now we find ourselves in an economic dispute with our allies over the question of East-West trade. The specific point at issue has been the Russian desire to purchase 40-inch pipe from Western countries. We have refused to sell the Russians this pipe, fearing it will disrupt the Western oil market, and have put pressure on our allies to do the same.

However, our British and German allies do not look on such sales with the same alarm, and their businessmen have been very interested in increasing trade relations with the Soviet Union. This particular issue is only symptomatic of the broader and more important question of East-West trade and what kind of common policy, if any, shall be worked out among the NATO powers.

Although we are the most powerful member of the Alliance, we must not forget that our allies are independent nations which sometimes have a different conception of their interests than we do. Without exception they depend heavily on foreign trade for their economic survival; for us it is less important involving only 4 percent of our manufactured goods. The problem of East-West trade is a crucial one not only in the relations between ourselves and our allies, but between the Atlantic Alliance and the Soviet Union.

An editorial in the April 2 Washington Post outlines some of these problems and I commend it to my colleagues. The two points it makes are those to which we must address ourselves if the present drift and disintegration within the alliance are to be stemmed: First, our allies have a vital economic stake in the maintenance of East-West trade; second, trade can be an instrument for the reduction of political tension if intelligently applied.

EAST-WEST TRADE

Should Britain sell pipeline to the Soviet Union? The United States says no, invoking the goal of NATO unity and the specter of building up the enemy. The British, a trading people with heavy unemployment,

say yes, downgrading the importance of a Soviet purchase. Here in a nutshell is the problem of East-West trade.

This newspaper has already stated its opinion that the United States has the right to explain its viewpoint to its allies which trade with Russia. It has done so not only to Great Britain but to West Germany, Italy, and Japan. By the same token of fairness, the nations approached have the right to decide the question for themselves. They should not be the butt of American censure or reprisal if, within the limitations prescribed by NATO policy, they choose to trade.

The NATO limitations amount to the lowest common denominator of agreement among the allies. Unilaterally, the United States has put far tighter shackles on itself. If official Washington is unhappy about the g.p. and it is, it should keep in mind that it is a member of an alliance, not the "Moscow" of the Western "bloc." American irritation would seem to be the cheap price of participation in a grouping of political equals.

The fact is that East-West trading prospects are far from unlimited. The NATO controls amount to a floor. Soviet realities make a ceiling: Moscow's foreign exchange situation, its commitment to economic self-sufficiency, its short shelf of wares and short shopping list and its onerous trade practices. As for goods in the gray area between the American and NATO controls, such as pipeline, trade stoppage will only encourage Soviet development of a domestic supply. The United States sees pipeline as an iron snake writhing into the Western European oil market. Even if this questionable image turns out to be the proper one, the touted Soviet "oil offensive" will have to be met on other terms.

One does not have to accept the Kremlin's cant in order to believe that trade offers one small possibility of taking the tension from East-West relations and of forming the habit and the pattern of mutually advantageous contact. It is high time that this possibility be explored.

The Late Dr. E. H. Givens, of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, on March 26, 1963, the Senate of the 58th Legislature of Texas adopted Senate Resolution 315 in memory of Dr. E. H. Givens, of Austin, Tex.

This is a splendid and deserved tribute to Dr. Givens. He and I were close, personal friends over the years. Because of what his life meant to Austin, the State of Texas, and our beloved country, I will insert the senate resolution at this point:

SENATE RESOLUTION 315

Whereas in the passing of Dr. Everett H. Givens on the 6th day of November 1962, the city of Austin lost a dedicated and able civic leader; and

Whereas Dr. Givens devoted most of his life to the betterment of educational standards and economic conditions of members of his race; and

Whereas his intelligent and logical approach to controversial matters made him an effective champion of many causes and earned for him the respect of people in all walks of life; and

Whereas Dr. Givens worked tirelessly for east Austin, giving his wise counsel in fostering better understanding, and his passing is an irreparable loss to thousands of people who for so many years depended on his wisdom and guidance; and

Whereas it is the desire of the Senate of the 58th Legislature of the State of Texas to honor the memory of this most worthy citizen: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That when the senate adjourns today it do so in his memory, and that a page in the permanent journal of the senate be devoted to the recording of this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Dr. Givens' widow as an expression of sympathy and as a small token of the respect in which Dr. Everett H. Givens was held by the members of the Senate of Texas.

Buy American Act on Ships Tightened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1963

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, because the action taken by the Secretary of Defense in tightening the provisions of the Buy American Act is of great importance to all of us and to our constituents, I am inserting an article from the Baltimore Sun of April 5, outlining the Secretary's administrative order in this regard:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, April 5, 1963]

BUY AMERICAN ACT ON SHIPS TIGHTENED

(By Helen Delich Bentley)

WASHINGTON, April 4.—The Defense Department has tightened its Buy American Act provisions in three pending bids for construction of Navy ships, Representative GARMATZ, Democrat, of Maryland announced today.

The Secretary of Defense has taken administrative action to change the standard for defining American-made goods from 50 to 90 percent of the cost of materials or products involved in ship construction, GARMATZ said.

"The effect of this new standard is to require contractors on ship construction to use materials and products largely of American manufacture," he added.

COMPLAINTS NOTED

"Under the usual procurement rules, a manufactured item qualifies as American-made so long as the cost of foreign-made material does not exceed 50 percent of the total Many business firms have complained that competitors with cheap labor and materials often have been able to underbid them in Government procurements."

GARMATZ referred to a recent instance where the Navy Bureau of Ships awarded a conversion contract for two AO-22 fleet oilers to Puget Sound Bridge & Drydock Co., a Northwest firm owned by Lockheed Aircraft Corp. Puget Sound was able to underbid east coast shipbuilding firms by proposing to have midsections of the hulls fabricated in Japan.

Since the cost of foreign-made goods entering into the contract operation would have been 36 percent, somewhat less than the 50 percent ceiling, the Navy decided that Puget Sound was entitled to the award under the Buy American Act and Executive Order 10582 Implementing the act.